

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 and 25-29 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Uusimaki Matti (EP 1 107 101 A2) (hereinafter Matti) in view of Eromaki Marko et al., (EP 1 051 012 A2) (hereinafter Marko).

Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

The rejection admits that Matti fails to teach a module for performing an operation based on a selection of information displayed on a display, and wherein the operation is based on the content of the selection of information displayed on the display, as previously claimed. The rejection relies on Marko. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the following.

Independent Claim 1 recites that the processor is operable to perform an operation that is associated with rendered information that is identified by the relative position of the sliding component with respect to the display, and wherein the operation is responsive to the button input being pressed, as claimed.

In contrast, Marko discloses a portable electronic device with a sliding attached touch screen and a sliding lid having a keyboard on top thereof (see Marko, page 1). Marko further discloses that the sliding touch screen and the

sliding lid (having a keyboard) can move away, thereby revealing more of the display (see Marko, page 1). Marko discloses that in a closed configuration, the user may use a small display and a small keyboard and while in the open configuration, the user can use the more complete keyboard or an extended display, e.g., dialing a telephone number or typing a text message (see Marko, paragraph 23).

Accordingly, Marko discloses using a small keyboard or a complete keyboard or an extended display for interaction, e.g., dialing or typing a text message. However, Marko fails to teach or suggest how information rendered by the display is selected or identified. For example, Marko does not teach or suggest that the sliding component is used to identify rendered information, as claimed. As such, Marko fails to teach or suggest that the operation is associated with rendered information that is identified by the relative position of the sliding component with respect to the display, and wherein the operation is responsive to the button input being pressed, as claimed.

Accordingly, Matti alone or in combination with Marko fails to render independent Claim 1 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Independent Claims 8 and 25 recite limitations similar to that of Claim 1, as presented above, and are patentable for similar reasons. For example, Claims 8 recites detecting a user selecting the first element, wherein the selection is made by using at least one

button input residing on the sliding component when the sliding component is adjacent to the first element, as claimed. Claim 25 recites that the position of the sliding component is further operable to identify a first graphical element from the plurality of graphical elements when the sliding component is adjacent to the first graphical element, and wherein the first graphical element is selected responsive to a selection by a user via an input key on the sliding component, as claimed.

Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 16 recites displaying a plurality of objects on the display, as claimed. Moreover, independent Claim 16 recites generating the visual output on the display, wherein the visual output comprises the plurality of visual objects that are arranged and repositioned to be viewable in response to the relative position, as claimed. Accordingly, the visual objects prior to moving the sliding component are displayed after the sliding component moves, but the visual objects are arranged and reconfigured to fit in the display that has now changed size.

The rejection asserts that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the mobile station shown in figs. 14-15 that comprises a keyboard, display area must contain a processor/controller to display graphical elements using the inputting interface as a key board.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the recited limitations are still not taught even

if it is assumed that a processor/controller displays graphical elements, as alleged by the rejection. A description of displaying graphical elements, as alleged by the rejection, fails to teach or suggest that the plurality of visual objects that are arranged and repositioned to be viewable in response to the relative position, as claimed.

Independent Claim 25 recites a limitation similar to that of Claim 16 and is patentable for similar reasons. For example, Claim 25 recites that the processor is operable to reposition the plurality of graphical elements responsive to the position of the sliding component with respect to the display, as claimed.

Accordingly, Matti alone or in combination with Marko fails to render independent Claim 16 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency. Independent Claim 25 recites limitations similar to that of Claim 16, as presented and discussed above. As such, independent Claim 25 is further patentable over the cited combination for reasons similar to that of Claim 16.

As per Claim 2, the rejection asserts that a display switch for changing the size of the display area is considered as the visual configuration action. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, a cover may mask a portion of a display, thereby reducing the viewable size. However, masking a portion of a

display does not configure data rendered on the display, as claimed, because the rendered data is still present but is rather covered by masking the display. For example, covering a portion of the display does not change or move content rendered on the display. As such, Matti fails to teach or suggest that the operation is a visual configuration of data rendered on the display, as claimed. Claims 19, 20 and 29 are patentable for similar reasons.

As per Claim 3, Matti discloses an antenna (see Matti, Figure 1, element 29). However, an antenna, as disclosed by Matti, does not teach or suggest that the operation is an initiation of communication with another device using the wireless device, as claimed. For example, a radio antenna simply receives data without initiation of a communication, as claimed. As such, a mere disclosure of an antenna, as disclosed by Matti, fails to teach or suggest that the operation is an initiation of communication with another device using said wireless transmitter, as claimed.

As per Claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that Matti fails to teach or suggest the operation in the claimed fashion for reasons similar to that of Claim 3, as presented and discussed above. As such, Matti fails to teach or suggest that the operation is an initiation of communication with an external device, as claimed.

Claims 9-10 recite limitations similar to that of Claims 1-3 and are patentable for similar reasons.

As per Claim 11, Matti in view of Marko fails to teach or suggest that the operation that is associated with rendered information that is identified by the relative position of the sliding component with respect to the display, and wherein the operation is responsive to the button input being pressed, as recited by Claim 1. Thus, Matti in view of Marko similarly fails to teach or suggest that the operation is a display of related additional information to the first element, as recited by Claim 11 under similar rationale.

Claims 17-20 recite limitations similar to that of Claims 9-11 and are patentable for similar reasons.

As such, allowance of Claims 1-20 and 25-29 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 and 25-29 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 and 25-29 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 9-9-2009

/Amir A. Tabarrok/
Amir A. Tabarrok
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile